

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
WASHINGTON, 25, D.C.

NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☒
☐ DECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C
NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE: 12 MAR 1981 REVIEWER: _____

STAT

Dear Sirs :

I had a faint hope that in my time I would not see a third world war, but I may be still mistaken.

The reason of the First world war was Power.
The Second world war was Petroleum.

On the surface it looks that the possible Third World War smells also after petroleum. Behind the second was nothing else. Behind the present situation is something far more dangerous. It is the difference between two irreconcilable systems. Petroleum, Suez Canal, England and France, etc. are all details, nevermind what may be said in the newspapers and in official communications.

From this morning's paper I cut the attached article. I underlined point 3. What struck me that it was taken up and Senator Ellender not being capable to show Krushchev that a real ideal can only be based on a solid natural foundation.

The trouble with our points of view is that Communism is based on politics and as such we attack it with a success that even a Mr. Nasser asks for assistance not in the U.S.A., but in the U.S.S.R.

For Western Europe there does not seem to be another possibility to conquer the Arabs as to side with Russia, the probable idea of Mr. Krushchev, etc. If that happens in some time we may stand alone against Europe, Asia and Africa.

I do not know if anybody in your great organization ever studied Das Kapital by Karl Marx and read the preface to the first edition and asked himself WHAT was the kind of criticism Marx was asking for and came to the conclusion that the foundation of his entire explanation was a very simple foundation, which you can read on page 56 of the English translation by Ernest Untermann: 20 yards of linen = 1 coat.

Our conventional science has never been capable of showing that this equation had no natural foundation in the way of physics and mathematics. Neither could Senator Ellender. In one way Krushchev was right in so far that we could never show him that Marx was wrong. And political "ideals" simply do not exist. Therefore it is too curved.

What the gentlemen who have studied the material I had put at your disposition was the expression of another ideal and which is basically also so simple that just like communism, the things around it have overshadowed its simplicity.

It is about 3000 years ago that someone wrote down the words : Love thy neighbour like thyself. This was very nice but after all it was an advice which had only superficial value. As can be shown.

The Golden Rule was perhaps still older. But also this was a nice advice and you could go away with hitting your neighbour and do to him all the things which you did not like to have done to yourself.

Until about 2000 years ago somebody coupled the two advices together

For this he was made the only son of God Himself, at least by many of his fellowmen. The seven hundred and so different religions which resulted lost in details which had nothing to do with the natural foundation and which are still fighting each other tooth and nail, and which was also one of the reasons that Marx wanted to do away with them, had in 2000 years not the success which Marx had in 90.

Let us consider now the coupling of the advices of love thy neighbour and the Golden Rule from the same point of view as Karl Marx considered communism, from plainest physics and mathematics.

For "Love thy neighbour like thyself" you can write :
thy neighbour equals thyself or
thy neighbour = thyself

In algebraic language you can write this in the form :

$$3 a = 4 b$$

and which is mathematically correct but does not say anything as that water is water.

But add now the Golden Rule to it, which says : do not unto others what you like to have not done to yourself. Or add not something bad to your neighbour. In algebraic language what we call "bad" can be expressed by the letter "c".

In the material I have provided to your Agency on the basis of the also extremely simple equation : 2 apples + 2 apples = 4 apples it was shown that physics and mathematics were only discovered by man, but not made. That their origin was a far more intelligent energy than man. Using that same language which is considered by the most "intelligent" people of this world, to be exact and precise, we can now write for the above, when we add something bad to our neighbour :

$$3 a + c = 4 b \text{ ??????}$$

It is this what would not be exact so that we have to write :

$$3 a + c = 4 b + c$$

in words, if you add something bad to your neighbour, automatically and in the most exact language possible, you add it to yourself.

Never before and never since then a better advice to humanity has been given for the evolution of the human standard of living.

Or an ideal based on a natural (not human) foundation. Place against that the linen-coat equation of Karl Marx and use my products and cost equations and though Marx meant it alright the basis of his meaning was a human invention and to which is always an efficiency factor attached.

In the way we have fought communism it seems that the efficiency factor has been so low that Nasser took the Suez Canal and by going along with Russia may declench a Third world war.

In the end the linen-coat formula will never win, but which does not mean that we cannot return to some other Dark Ages.

If you cannot detect something wrong in the above explanation it can go straight to the waste paper basket. If your most intelligent men cannot, then I hope it may set them thinking.

Very truly yours,